



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,170	03/29/2001	Dan Martin Scott	108344.00016	4015

7590 06/20/2002
Steven W. Thrasher
Jackson Walker, LLP
2435 North Central Expressway, #600
Richardson, TX 75080

EXAMINER

WALLACE, SCOTT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,170

Applicant(s)

DAN MARTIN SCOTT

Examiner

Scott Wallace

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8 and 10-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7,9 and 17-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 8 lines 16 and 23, steps 400 and 405 are not mentioned in the figs and fig.4 is not mentioned in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saylor et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,487,139.
3. As per claim 1, Saylor et al. teaches a system that enables the georeferencing of a digital raster map, comprising: a processing platform for executing code capable of georeferencing a digital raster map (column 2 lines 25-49); and a storage platform for storing at least a digital raster map, the storage platform coupled to the processing platform (column 2 lines 48-60).
4. As per claim 2, Saylor et al. teaches a user interaction device coupled to the processing platform (column 3 lines 54-64).
5. As per claim 3, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the processing platform is enabled to georeference a digital raster map based on a second map that is already georeferenced (column 2 lines 49-61).

6. As per claim 4, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the processing platform is a microprocessor (column 3 lines 54-64).
7. As per claim 5, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the map processing platform is an application service provider (column 4 lines 7-15).
8. As per claim 6, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the map processing platform is located remotely from a user of the processing platform (column 4 lines 19-47).
9. As per claim 8, Saylor et al. teaches the storage platform comprises system memory (column 2 lines 48-60).
10. As per claim 10, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the user interaction device comprises at least a display device (column 2 lines 49-60).
11. As per claim 11, Saylor et al. teaches where in the processing platform is coupled to the storage platform via a network (column 4 lines 44-47).
12. As per claim 12, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the network is the internet (column 4 lines 19-47).
13. As per claim 13, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the storage platform maintains a plurality of digital raster maps (column 4 lines 19-25).
14. As per claim 14, Saylor et al. teaches wherein the storage platform maintains a database of georeferencing functions that associate a digital raster map location with a georeferenced location in a second map (column 2 lines 25-48).
15. As per claim 15, Saylor et al. teaches providing for display a first map and a second map, the first map being a digital raster map, and the second map being a previously georeferenced map (column 2 lines 25-47); the first map being substantially similar to the second map when displayed (column 2 lines 25-47); receiving an entry identifying a first point pair point on the first map (column 2 lines 49-61); receiving an entry identifying a second point pair point on the second map (column 2 lines 49-61), the second point pair point having approximately the same location on the second map as the first point pair point has on the first map (column 2 lines 49-61); assigning a point pair point on the first map a longitude coordinate and a latitude coordinate, the longitude coordinate and the latitude coordinate of the first point pair point being identical to a longitude point and a latitude point associated with a point pair point on the

second map (column 7 lines 65-67 and column 8 lines 1-7). Providing for display a first map and a second map, the first map being a digital raster map, and the second map being a previously georeferenced map (column 9 lines 20-25); and assigning a point pair point on the first map a longitude coordinate and a latitude coordinate of a point pair point on the second map (column 9 lines 34-47).

16. As per claim 16, Saylor et al. teaches providing for display a first map and a second map, the first map being a digital raster map, and the second map being a previously georeferenced map (column 2 lines 25-47); the first map being substantially similar to the second map when displayed (column 2 lines 25-47); receiving an entry identifying a first point pair point on the first map (column 2 lines 49-61); receiving an entry identifying a second point pair point on the second map (column 2 lines 49-61), the second point pair point having approximately the same location on the second map as the first point pair point has on the first map (column 2 lines 49-61); assigning a point pair point on the first map a longitude coordinate and a latitude coordinate, the longitude coordinate and the latitude coordinate of the first point pair point being identical to a longitude point and a latitude point associated with a point pair point on the second map (column 7 lines 65-67 and column 8 lines 1-7).

Allowable Subject Matter

17. Claims 7,9,and 17-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

18. As per claim 7, prior art of record fails to teach a system that enables the georeferencing of a digital raster map wherein the storage platform comprises a cached memory.

19. As per claim 9, prior art of record fails to teach a system that enables the georeferencing of a digital raster map wherein the storage platform comprises a non-cached volatile storage.

20. As per claim 17, prior art of record fails to teach a data structure capable of georeferencing a raster map comprising creating a georeferencing function.

21. As per claim 18, prior art of record fails to teach a data structure capable of georeferencing a raster map comprising receiving a mark on the first map at a location and reproducing the mark on the second map at a corresponding location.
22. As per claim 19, prior art of record fails to teach a data structure capable of georeferencing a raster map comprising using at least four point pairs to complete the georeferencing function for the map based on a linear transformation, and further comprising executing a validation check.
23. As per claim 20, prior art of record fails to teach a data structure capable of georeferencing a raster map comprising rejecting a point pair when the point pair deviates a pre-determined amount from a predetermined standard error.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Scott Wallace** whose telephone number is **703-605-5163**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at 703-305-4713.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Application/Control Number: 09/821,170
Art Unit: 2672

Page 6

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Razavi', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600